

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE  
Transcriber's Office

January 21, 2000 LB 182

me respond to Senator Redfield. The questions you raise are all of the right questions. I don't interpret the bill as having the result that you describe. First of all, I think the bill is clear in its operative provisions that the school districts have absolutely full right to make that publications code whatever they want it to be. The language in subsection (2), which is finding language, expresses a general feeling of the Legislature, which, if you disagree with, I would...you know, it doesn't bother me to strike that language in the finding section. It expresses what the Legislature wishes the school districts would do, what they ought to do. Remember, it doesn't say "shall" in that section at all. It says what they ought to do. And the idea is to encourage school districts to allow students the maximum that they feel comfortable with, the maximum that the administrators feel comfortable with. But, if they don't feel comfortable with a broad latitude of expression, the operative provision of the statute is Section 4, which says you can do whatever you want. Again, the idea is that there is great advantage to doing it ahead of time so that everybody knows the rules, so that when particular situations come up we know what the rules are and so...and also, as expressed in the bill, to disconnect school policy on an issue from a particular incident. In other words, this...in one of the places in this particular bill it says that the student positions on an issue, following a code, are not the positions of a school. So an administrator can take this statute and say, look, this is what we're required to do, this is why we do it, it's not the school policy, it's the instrument...this is an instrument for teaching young Americans how to operate under the First Amendment. And they'll be able to structure it so that there are no egregious errors, but that doesn't mean that from time to time there won't be things that bother a certain element of our population. After all, when you and I read the newspaper each and every day, there's at least one or two things in it that bother us greatly. (Laughter) And, of course, the newspapers are filled with controversy, and really, I mean, that's what newspapers are about, isn't it, helping us think about the future and what should be and what shouldn't be through the presentation of those tough, controversial questions. And I don't know how young journalists can get into that mode without doing, without being allowed to think about what the parameters of the First Amendment are and how they need to operate to be thoughtful